

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

JANE DOE 1, Individually and on Behalf of  
All Others Similarly Situated,

Plaintiff,

-v-

DEUTSCHE BANK AKTIENGESELLSCHAFT, DEUTSCHE  
BANK AG NEW YORK BRANCH, DEUTSCHE BANK  
TRUST COMPANY AMERICAS,

Defendants.

22-cv-10018 (JSR)

JANE DOE 1, Individually and on Behalf of  
All Others Similarly Situated,

Plaintiff,

-v-

JP MORGAN CHASE BANK, N.A.,

Defendant/Third-Party Plaintiff,

-v-

JAMES EDWARD STALEY,

Third-Party Defendant.

22-cv-10019 (JSR)

GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES VIRGIN  
ISLANDS,

Plaintiff,

-v-

JP MORGAN CHASE BANK, N.A.,

Defendant/Third-Party Plaintiff,

-v-

JAMES EDWARD STALEY,

Third-Party Defendant.

22-cv-10904 (JSR)

ORDER

JED S. RAKOFF, U.S.D.J.:

Plaintiffs in two of the above-captioned cases are anonymous. For clarity, the Court will refer to plaintiff in Jane Doe v. Deutsche Bank Aktiengesellschaft et al., 22-cv-10018, as "DB Jane Doe."

On April 14, 2023, defendant JP Morgan Chase Bank, N.A. ("JP Morgan") and third-party defendant James ("Jes") Staley moved to compel disclosure of DB Jane Doe's identity to them. While DB Jane Doe has a significant privacy interest that weighs against such disclosure, movants have provided the Court with strong reason to believe that she has information that is relevant to their defenses. See Fed. R. Civ. Pro. 26(b)(1) (setting forth the scope of discovery). Thus, the Court hereby grants their motion. Counsel for DB Jane Doe is hereby ordered to disclose DB Jane Doe's identity to JP Morgan and to Jes Staley on a confidential basis, pursuant to the operative protective order in

Jane Doe v. JP Morgan Chase Bank, N.A., 22-cv-10019. See ECF No. 35  
(the protective order).<sup>1</sup>

The Clerk is respectfully directed to close entries numbered 85  
and 86 on the docket of this case.

SO ORDERED.

New York, NY  
April ~~18~~, ~~2023~~  
19 2023

  
JED S. RAKOFF, U.S.D.J.

---

<sup>1</sup> All references to ECF numbers in this Order refer to entries on the docket of  
Jane Doe v. JP Morgan Chase Bank, N.A., 22-cv-10019.